

F2N8SOKF

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

3 MARK I. SOKOLOW, et al.,

4 Plaintiffs,

5 v.

04 CV 397 (GBD)

6 PALESTINE LIBERATION  
7 ORGANIZATION, et al.,

8 Defendants.

9 New York, N.Y.  
10 February 23, 2015  
12:30 p.m.

11 Before:

12 HON. GEORGE B. DANIELS,

13 District Judge

14 APPEARANCES

15 ARNOLD & PORTER LLP  
Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
16 BY: KENT A. YALOWITZ  
PHILIP W. HORTON  
TAL MACHNES  
17 SARA PILDIS  
CARMELA T. ROMEO  
18 RACHEL WEISER  
LUCY S. McMILLAN

19 MILLER & CHEVALIER, CHARTERED  
Attorneys for Defendants  
20 BY: MARK J. ROCHON  
LAURA G. FERGUSON  
21 BRIAN A. HILL  
MICHAEL SATIN  
22 DAWN E. MURPHY-JOHNSON  
23  
24  
25

F2N8SOKF

(In open court; jury not present)

THE COURT: We have a note from the jury indicating they have reached a verdict. We will bring out the jury and take the verdict from the foreperson at this time.

(Jury present; time noted: 12:40 p.m.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we have received your note indicating that you have reached a verdict. I am going to ask my law clerk to take the verdict from the foreperson at this time by reading the questions and having you answer those questions.

LAW CLERK: Will the foreperson please rise?

Has the jury agreed upon a verdict.

FOREPERSON: Yes, we have.

THE COURT: Page 1. Jaffa Road shooting.

Did plaintiffs prove by a preponderance of the evidence that defendant PLO is liable for the January 22, 2002 attack because the PLO knowingly provided material support or resources that were used in preparation for or in carrying out this attack?

FOREPERSON: Yes.

LAW CLERK: Did plaintiffs prove by a preponderance of the evidence that defendant PA is liable for the January 22, 2002 attack because the PA knowingly provided material support or resources that were used in preparation for or in carrying out this attack?

F2N8SOKF

1 FOREPERSON: Yes.

2 LAW CLERK: Did plaintiffs prove by a preponderance of  
3 the evidence that defendant PA is liable for the January 22,  
4 2002 attack because an employee of the PA, acting within the  
5 scope of his employment and in furtherance of the activities of  
6 the PA, either carried out, or knowingly provided material  
7 support or resources that were used in preparation for or in  
8 carrying out, this attack?

9 FOREPERSON: Yes.

10 LAW CLERK: Page 2. Jaffa Road bombing.

11 Did plaintiffs prove by a preponderance of the  
12 evidence that defendant PLO is liable for the January 27, 2002  
13 attack because the PLO knowingly provided material support or  
14 resources that were used in preparation for or in carrying out  
15 this attack?

16 FOREPERSON: Yes.

17 LAW CLERK: Did plaintiffs prove by a preponderance of  
18 the evidence that defendant PA is liable for the January 27,  
19 2002 attack because the PA knowingly provided material support  
20 or resources that were used in preparation for or in carrying  
21 out this attack?

22 FOREPERSON: Yes.

23 LAW CLERK: Did plaintiffs prove by a preponderance of  
24 the evidence that defendant PA is liable for the January 27,  
25 2002 attack because an employee of the PA, acting within the

F2N8SOKF

1 scope of his employment and in furtherance of the activities of  
2 the PA, either carried out, or knowingly provided material  
3 support or resources that were used in preparation for or in  
4 carrying out, this attack?

5 FOREPERSON: Yes.

6 LAW CLERK: Page 3. King George Street bombing.

7 Did plaintiffs prove by a preponderance of the  
8 evidence that defendant PLO is liable for the March 21, 2002  
9 attack because the PLO knowingly provided material support or  
10 resources that were used in preparation for or in carrying out  
11 this an attack?

12 FOREPERSON: Yes.

13 LAW CLERK: Did plaintiffs prove by a preponderance of  
14 the evidence that defendant PA is liable for the March 21, 2002  
15 attack because the PA knowingly provided material support or  
16 resources that were used in preparation for or in carrying out  
17 this attack?

18 FOREPERSON: Yes.

19 LAW CLERK: Did plaintiffs prove by a preponderance of  
20 the evidence that defendant PA is liable for the March 21, 2002  
21 attack because an employee of the PA, acting within the scope  
22 of his employment and in furtherance of the activities of the  
23 PA, either carried out, or knowingly provided material support  
24 or resources that were used in preparation for or in carrying  
25 out, this attack?

F2N8SOKF

1 FOREPERSON: Yes.

2 LAW CLERK: Page 4. French Hill bombing.

3 Did plaintiffs prove by a preponderance of the  
4 evidence that defendant PLO is liable for the June 19, 2002  
5 attack because the PLO knowingly provided material support or  
6 resources that were used in preparation for or in carrying out  
7 this attack?

8 FOREPERSON: Yes.

9 LAW CLERK: Did plaintiffs prove by a preponderance of  
10 the evidence that defendant PA is liable for the June 19, 2002  
11 attack because the PA knowingly provided material support or  
12 resources that were used in preparation for or in carrying out  
13 this attack?

14 FOREPERSON: Yes.

15 LAW CLERK: Did plaintiffs prove by a preponderance of  
16 the evidence that defendant PLO is liable for the June 19, 2002  
17 attack because the PLO knowingly provided to the Al Aqsa  
18 Martyrs' Brigade, after its designation as a foreign terrorist  
19 organization, material support or resources that were used in  
20 preparation for or in carrying out this attack?

21 FOREPERSON: Yes.

22 LAW CLERK: Did plaintiffs prove by a preponderance of  
23 the evidence that defendant PA is liable for the June 19, 2002  
24 attack because the PA knowingly provided to the Al Aqsa  
25 Martyrs' Brigade, after its designation as a foreign terrorist

F2N8SOKF

1 organization, material support or resources that were used in  
2 preparation or in carrying out this attack?

3 FOREPERSON: Yes.

4 LAW CLERK: Page 5. Hebrew University bombing.

5 Did plaintiffs prove by a preponderance of the  
6 evidence that defendant PLO is liable for the July 31, 2002  
7 attack because the PLO knowingly provided material support or  
8 resources that were used in preparation for or in carrying out  
9 this attack?

10 FOREPERSON: Yes.

11 LAW CLERK: Did plaintiffs prove by a preponderance of  
12 the evidence that defendant PA is liable for the July 31, 2002  
13 attack because the PA knowingly provided material support or  
14 resources that were used in preparation for or in carrying out  
15 this attack?

16 FOREPERSON: Yes.

17 LAW CLERK: Did plaintiffs prove by a preponderance of  
18 the evidence that defendant PA is liable for the July 31, 2002  
19 attack because an employee of the PA, acting within the scope  
20 of his employment and in furtherance of the activities of the  
21 PA, either carried out, or knowingly provided material support  
22 or resources that were used in preparation for or in carrying  
23 out, this attack?

24 FOREPERSON: Yes.

25 LAW CLERK: Page 6.

F2N8SOKF

1 Did plaintiffs prove by a preponderance of the  
2 evidence that the defendant PLO is liable for the July 31, 2002  
3 attack because the PLO knowingly provided to Hamas, after its  
4 designation as a foreign terrorist organization, material  
5 support or resources that were used in preparation for or in  
6 carrying out this attack?

7 FOREPERSON: Yes.

8 LAW CLERK: Did plaintiffs prove by a preponderance of  
9 the evidence that defendant PA is liable for the July 31, 2002  
10 attack because the PA knowingly provided to Hamas, after its  
11 designation as a foreign terrorist organization, material  
12 support or resources that were used in preparation for or in  
13 carrying out this attack?

14 FOREPERSON: Yes.

15 LAW CLERK: Did plaintiffs prove by a preponderance of  
16 the evidence that defendant PLO is liable for the July 31, 2002  
17 attack because the PLO harbored or concealed a person who the  
18 PLO knew, or had reasonable grounds to believe, committed or  
19 was about to commit this attack?

20 FOREPERSON: Yes.

21 LAW CLERK: Did plaintiffs prove by a preponderance of  
22 the evidence that defendant PA is liable for the July 31, 2002  
23 attack because the PA harbored or concealed a person who the PA  
24 knew, or had reasonable grounds to believe, committed or was  
25 about to commit this attack?

F2N8SOKF

1 FOREPERSON: Yes.

2 LAW CLERK: Page 7. Bus No. 19 bombing.

3 Did plaintiffs prove by a preponderance of the  
4 evidence that defendant PLO is liable for the January 29, 2004  
5 attack because the PLO knowingly provided material support or  
6 resources that were used in preparation for or in carrying out  
7 this attack?

8 FOREPERSON: Yes.

9 LAW CLERK: Did plaintiffs prove by a preponderance of  
10 the evidence that defendant PA is liable for the January 29,  
11 2004 attack because the PA knowingly provided material support  
12 or resources that were used in preparation for or in carrying  
13 out this attack?

14 FOREPERSON: Yes.

15 LAW CLERK: Did plaintiffs prove by a preponderance of  
16 the evidence that defendant PA is liable for the January 29,  
17 2004 attack because an employee of the PA, acting within the  
18 scope of his employment and in furtherance of the activities of  
19 the PA, either carried out, or knowingly provided material  
20 support or resources that were used in preparation for or in  
21 carrying out, this attack?

22 FOREPERSON: Yes.

23 LAW CLERK: Page 8.

24 Did plaintiffs prove by a preponderance of the  
25 evidence that defendant PLO is liable for the January 29, 2004



F2N8SOKF

1 attack because the PLO knowingly provided the to the Al Aqsa  
2 Martyrs' Brigade, after its designation as a foreign terrorist  
3 organization, material support or resources that were used in  
4 preparation for or in carrying out this attack?

5 FOREPERSON: Yes.

6 LAW CLERK: Did plaintiffs prove by a preponderance of  
7 the evidence that defendant PA is liable for the January 29,  
8 2004 attack because the PA knowingly provided to the Al Aqsa  
9 Martyrs' Brigade, after its designation as a foreign terrorist  
10 organization, material support or resources that were used in  
11 preparation for or in carrying out this attack?

12 FOREPERSON: Yes.

13 LAW CLERK: Page 10. Jaffa Road shooting.

14 What amount of damages, if any, do you award as  
15 compensation for plaintiff Elise Gould's injuries that you  
16 determine were caused by the January 22, 2002 terrorist attack?

17 FOREPERSON: \$3 million.

18 LAW CLERK: What amount, if any, do you award for  
19 plaintiff Ronald Gould?

20 FOREPERSON: \$3 million.

21 LAW CLERK: What amount, if any, do you award for  
22 plaintiff Shayna Gould?

23 FOREPERSON: \$20 million.

24 LAW CLERK: What amount, if any, do you award for  
25 plaintiff Jessica Rine?

F2N8SOKF

1 FOREPERSON: \$3 million.

2 LAW CLERK: Page 11.

3 What amount, if any, do you award for plaintiff Henna  
4 Novack Waldman?

5 FOREPERSON: \$2,500,000.

6 LAW CLERK: What amount, if any, do you award for  
7 plaintiff Morris Waldman?

8 FOREPERSON: \$2,500,000.

9 LAW CLERK: What amount, if any, do you award for  
10 plaintiff Shmuel Waldman?

11 FOREPERSON: \$7,500,000.

12 LAW CLERK: Page 12.

13 What amount, if any, do you award for plaintiff Elana  
14 Sokolow?

15 FOREPERSON: \$2,500,000.

16 LAW CLERK: This is the Jaffa Road bombing.

17 What amount, if any, do you award for plaintiff Jamie  
18 Sokolow?

19 FOREPERSON: \$6,500,000.

20 LAW CLERK: What amount, if any, do you award for  
21 plaintiff Lauren Sokolow?

22 FOREPERSON: \$5 million.

23 LAW CLERK: What amount, if any, do you award for  
24 plaintiff Mark Sokolow?

25 FOREPERSON: \$5 million.

F2N8SOKF

LAW CLERK: Page 13.

What amount, if any, do you award for plaintiff Rena Sokolow?

FOREPERSON: \$7,500,000.

LAW CLERK: Page 14. King George Street bombing.

What amount, if any, do you award for plaintiff Alan Bauer?

FOREPERSON: \$7 million.

LAW CLERK: What amount, if any, do you award for plaintiff Binyamin Bauer?

FOREPERSON: \$1 million.

LAW CLERK: What amount, if any, do you award for plaintiff Daniel Bauer?

FOREPERSON: \$1 million.

LAW CLERK: What amount, if any, do you award for plaintiff Yehonathon Bauer.

FOREPERSON: \$25 million.

LAW CLERK: Page 15.

What amount, if any, do you award for plaintiff Yehuda Bauer?

FOREPERSON: \$1 million.

LAW CLERK: Page 16. French Hill bombing.

What amount, if any, do you award for plaintiff Leonard Mandelkorn?

FOREPERSON: \$10 million.

F2N8SOKF

1 LAW CLERK: Page 17. Hebrew University bombing.

2 What amount, if any, do you award for plaintiff

3 Katherine Baker?

4 FOREPERSON: \$6 million.

5 LAW CLERK: What amount, if any, do you award for

6 plaintiff Benjamin Blutstein?

7 FOREPERSON: \$2,500,000.

8 LAW CLERK: What amount, if any, do you award for

9 plaintiff Rebekah Blutstein?

10 FOREPERSON: \$4 million.

11 LAW CLERK: Page 18.

12 What amount, if any, do you award for plaintiff

13 Richard Blutstein?

14 FOREPERSON: \$6 million.

15 LAW CLERK: What amount, if any, do you award for

16 plaintiff Diane Carter?

17 FOREPERSON: \$1 million.

18 LAW CLERK: What amount, if any, do you award for

19 plaintiff Larry Carter?

20 FOREPERSON: \$6,500,000.

21 LAW CLERK: What amount, if any, do you award for

22 plaintiff Shaun Choffel?

23 FOREPERSON: \$1,500,000.

24 LAW CLERK: What amount, if any, do you award for

25 plaintiff Robert L. Coulter, Jr.?

F2N8SOKF

1 FOREPERSON: \$3 million.

2 LAW CLERK: What amount, if any, do you award for  
3 plaintiff Diane Coulter Miller?

4 FOREPERSON: \$3 million.

5 LAW CLERK: What amount, if any, do you award for  
6 plaintiff Robert L. Coulter, Sr.?

7 FOREPERSON: \$7,500,000.

8 LAW CLERK: Page 19.

9 What amount, if any, do you award for plaintiff Janis  
10 Ruth Coulter?

11 FOREPERSON: \$2,500,000.

12 LAW CLERK: What amount, if any, do you award for  
13 plaintiff David Gritz?

14 FOREPERSON: \$2,500,000.

15 LAW CLERK: What amount, if any, do you award for  
16 plaintiff Nevenka Gritz?

17 FOREPERSON: \$10 million.

18 LAW CLERK: What amount, if any, do you award for  
19 plaintiff Nevenka Gritz as successor to Norman Gritz?

20 FOREPERSON: \$2,500,000.

21 LAW CLERK: Page 20.

22 Bus No. 19 bombing.

23 What amount, if any, do you award to plaintiff Chana  
24 Goldberg?

25 FOREPERSON: \$8 million.

F2N8SOKF

1           LAW CLERK: What amount, if any, do you award to  
2 plaintiff Eliezer Goldberg?

3           FOREPERSON: \$4 million.

4           LAW CLERK: What amount, if any, do you award to  
5 plaintiff Esther Goldberg?

6           FOREPERSON: \$8 million.

7           LAW CLERK: What amount, if any, do you award for  
8 plaintiff Karen Goldberg?

9           FOREPERSON: \$13 million.

10          LAW CLERK: Page 21.

11          What amount, if any, do you award to plaintiff  
12 Shoshana Goldberg?

13          FOREPERSON: \$4 million.

14          LAW CLERK: What amount, if any, do you award to  
15 plaintiff Tzvi Goldberg?

16          FOREPERSON: \$2 million.

17          LAW CLERK: What amount, if any, do you award to  
18 plaintiff Yaakov Goldberg?

19          FOREPERSON: \$2 million.

20          LAW CLERK: What amount, if any, do you award to  
21 plaintiff Yitzhak Goldberg?

22          FOREPERSON: \$6 million.

23          THE COURT: Poll the jury, please.

24          (Jury polled; each juror answered in the affirmative)

25          THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, I thank you very

F2N8SOKF

1 much for your service as jurors in this case. I have to tell  
2 you that we recognize how serious a responsibility that you  
3 have and you had and how seriously you took that  
4 responsibility. I know that this was a major disruption of  
5 both your personal and your professional lives to serve as  
6 jurors on this case.

7 So at this point I am going to discharge you from any  
8 further jury service with the thanks of the Court. Thank you  
9 very much.

10 (Jury excused)

11 THE COURT: If you intend to submit further motions,  
12 just send me a letter within the next 30 days indicating a  
13 schedule for that and I will wait to hear from the parties.

14 MR. YALOWITZ: We will give you a form of judgment  
15 this afternoon. Would you prefer that by hand or e-mail?

16 THE COURT: Make sure the other side has it first, but  
17 either way, you can prepare and send it to me and I will wait  
18 to see if there is any response from the other side.

19 MR. ROCHON: In terms of our post verdict 50(b)  
20 motion, we would orally ask for an extension of the page limits  
21 to 50 pages at this time.

22 MR. YALOWITZ: We oppose that.

23 THE COURT: I will grant you that.

24 MR. ROCHON: Nothing else from us.

25 THE COURT: I will wait to hear from the parties.

F2N8SOKF

1 MR. YALOWITZ: Thank you, your Honor.

2 MR. ROCHON: Thank you.

3 (Trial concluded)

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25